DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 065 CG 009 883

AUTHOR Langmeyer, David B.; Starkey, Kathryn
TITLE The Effect of Training on Value-Sharing on Semantic Differential Scores.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 PLUS POSTAGE. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Drug Abuse; Measurement Techniques; *Parent Attitudes; Research Projects; Semantic Differential; Speeches; Teachers; *Teaching Methods; *Test Results; *Training Techniques; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Value Sharing

ABSTRACT

Earlier training attempts to prevent drug abuse were predicated on a cognitive-behavior link. Increased information generally resulted in more positive attitudes toward drug use. An educational alternative which may intervene in drug taking behavior is Value-Sharing. Parents in a Value-Sharing course were administered a form of the Semantic Differential Scale with targets of "self as parent" and "ideal parent". A reduction in the difference between real and ideal ratings resulted from the pre-post tests. One hundred school personnel will be measured with a "self as teacher" and "ideal teacher" scale. A similar reduction is anticipated. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

4.21

ED108065

THE EFFECT OF TRAINING IN VALUE-SHARING ON SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES

David B. Langmeyer
Tri-County Council on Addictive Diseases, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Kathryn Starkey
The Pennsylvania State University at Middletown

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Earlier training attempts to prevent drug abuse were predicated on a cognitive-behavior link. Increased information generally resulted in more positive attitudes toward drug use. An educational alternative which may intervene in drug taking behavior is Value-Sharing. Parents in a Value-Sharing course were administered a form of the Semantic Differential Scale with targets of "self as parent" and "ideal parent". A reduction in the difference between real and ideal ratings resulted from the pre-post tests. One hundred school personnel will be measured with a "self as teacher" and "ideal teacher" scale. A similar reduction is anticipated.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association
Washington, D.C., April, 1975

CG009883

Drug Abuse Prevention programs have all too often assumed that there is a causal link between information and behavior such that increasing one's knowledge about a given subject will lead one to behave in a proper manner (our way). It seems strange that this assumption persists into new areas, such as drug abuse prevention, considering its shaky history in having an impact on behaviors such as smoking, overeating, driving without seat belts, driving while intoxicated, and contracting venereal disease.

Cognitively based prevention has been gaining a reputation for being ineffective at best and possibly a source for the motivation to begin experimentation with illicit drugs. (Swisher, Crawford, Goldstein and Yura, 1971; Delone, 1972; Zazzaro, 1973.) Lack of information does not seem to be the problem for abusers and first time experimenters, rather there seems to be a complex of motives which include peer pressure, search for pleasure, curiosity, poor self-concept, boredom and lack of resistance to advertising messages. This list was suggested by and formed the basis for the drug education program in Coronado, California (Bensley, 1971; Carney, 1971). In June of 1971, Dr. Nancy Seiders, then with the Coronado Unified School District, ran a 45-hour training course for the teachers in Harrisburg under the auspices of Tri-County Council on Addictive Diseases. The program she presented has been expanded by the staff of TRI-AD and is called Value-Sharing (not a totally unique designation). Recently, the efforts at training teachers in Value-Sharing was augmented by having TRI-AD named as the South Central Regional Addictions Prevention Laboratory. The APL is a statewide effort at developing, testing and disseminating primary prevention strategies to the community. It is run out of the Counselor Education program at Pennsylvania State University and funded

by the Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse.*

Value-Sharing is a distillation of a model of education which places primary focus on human values (Rucker, Arnspiger and Brodbeck, 1969) and seeks to allow students to explore those values and identify a process for maximally enhancing personal values while also enhancing the values of others. The specific methods involved include special strategies for Values Clarification (Raths, Harmin and Simon, 1966), suggested communication techniques for the instructor, and practice in integrating personal values in subject matter (Harmin, Kirschenbaum and Simon, 1973).

While some of the techniques employed are specific to the classroom setting, most of them can and are employed in other environments, such as the family and client service agencies. The intended effect on the student population is indirect with regard to drug taking or other troublesome behaviors and involves a shift in self-concept, risk taking and decision making. For the parents and teachers involved in our training, the intended effects include making use of Value-Sharing techniques and a change in attitude about themselves.

With the latter goal in mind, a pilot study was carried out in the Spring of 1974 using parents enrolled in a five-session Value-Sharing for Parents Course. A form of the semantic differential (Osgood, Suci, Tanenbaum, 1957) was administered to them before taking the course and at the conclusion, with the target being "Self as Parent" and "Ideal Parent". It was hoped that as a result of the Value-Sharing training, the difference between the real and ideal endorsement would diminish. The

---

* Funds for the preparation of this report were provided by the Addictions Prevention Laboratory, Department of Counselor Education, The Pennsylvania State University. The APL is funded by the Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse of Pennsylvania.

implication of such a reduction in the difference score is that it is related to "Mental Health" (Rogers and Dymond, 1954). The results of that pilot effort were encouraging so that a larger sample was employed to further test the usefulness of the semantic differential to assess changes from Value-Sharing training.

The instrument used in the present study consists of 13 bi-polar stimuli chosen to assess a wide range of concepts toward the role of teacher and also to include the factor structure discovered to be included in virtually all concepts (Osgood, et al, 1957). Items are constructed on a seven point Likert format. Two assessments are made, one for "Myself as Teacher" and the other for "An Ideal Teacher". The forms were completed by each teacher enrolled in a teacher training course offered by TRI-AD in the Fall of 1974 during the first and the last session of the class. Two forms of training were employed, a 45-hour three credit graduate course and a 15-hour one credit in-service course.

The four sections of the in-service course involved a non-voluntary training program for two school districts. Each district had one section for elementary and one for secondary (7-12) with about 20 in the elementary course and 40 in the secondary. The three sections of the graduate course were voluntary and each was offered within different school districts. Of the 55 who took the course, 3 identified themselves as teaching above the 8th grade.

The items were scored so that seven represented the more socially desirable pole. A factor analysis revealed no clusters of items so no subscores were computed, instead, separate scores for each of the thirteen dimensions were used. Some data was lost on the posttest measure when one

instructor forgot a whole class. In addition, there was the expected attrition of teachers not present when the posttest was administered.

It was hypothesized that the difference between the Real and Ideal Teacher score on the pretest would be greater than the difference between the Real and Ideal Teacher score on the posttest. Therefore, a repeated measures factorial design was used.

There were three levels of repeated measures:

1. Pretest versus Posttest
2. Real Teacher versus Ideal Teacher
3. Thirteen separate bi-polar dimensions

Difference scores are generated and compared in this design.

(Insert Table 1)

Several describers of the teachers were identified; such as, sex of student, length of years in teaching and present grade assignment. In addition, there were two kinds of courses taught: one was 15 hours long; one, 45 hours long. There were seven instructors, four females and three males. When entering the date in various multi-factor designs, much data was discarded to meet the requirement of proportionality within the design. Although the subjects were discarded randomly, the number of subjects in any one factorial design varied greatly. Only those designs which included most of the data are summarized here.

RESULTS

If the Value-Sharing courses changed the semantic differential scores, then the longer course should make the greater change. No differences between teachers in the long or short courses should appear on the pretest,

but a difference should be there on the posttest; i.e., the teachers have no reason to be different according to the length of the course they are in on a pretest measure (N=103, probability=.234). However, on the posttest measure there should be greater differences for the longer course (N=103, probability=.008). Therefore, this hypothesis was supported by the data.

(Insert Table 2)

Since the hypothesis was that the post scores should be closer together, negative difference scores were predicted. Clearly the longer course is more effective. The difference between Real and Ideal does become less on the posttest and furthermore, the longer course produces more negative difference scores, ($t=2.82$, probability $<.01$).

Other analyses were done with varying numbers of people involved dependent on the particular factors analyzed. Only those with significant results are reported here.

An anlysis using the sex of the student as an independent variable revealed there was a greater impact of the Value-Sharing course on the female teachers (N=25 females and 25 males, probability=.004).

A further analysis on the length of the course and the number of years in a teaching career revealed that those who taught longer needed the longer course to effect an attitude change (N=50, probability=.01).

DISCUSSION

It seems appropriate here to outline the limitations for generalizability of this study: there were no control group measures; there were differences between the courses other than length of time in that students in the longer

course were volunteers and this course was given graduate credit requiring supervised implementation in the classroom; some classes were all female.

In three separate analyses the following questions were proposed:

1. Is there a change in the difference score as a result of Value-Sharing Training for teachers?

   Yes, posttest differences between Real and Ideal are less than pretest differences (N=50, probability=.027).

2. Does longer exposure to the Value-Sharing Course produce a greater change in difference scores?

   Yes, difference scores are reduced more in the scores in the longer course; however, the courses themselves vary in ways other than length which may be important in this result, (N=50, probability $<.01$).

3. Do female teachers change more than male teachers?

   Yes, females have difference scores smaller than male difference scores on the posttest, (N=50, probability=.004).

4. Do teachers who have been teaching longer need more time to change their attitudes?

   Yes, those who had taught longer changed more in the longer course, (N=50, probability=.01).

The preceding results constitute the analysis done to the present. It would be of interest to undertake two further analysis to understand the results and to continue in the present path of research with this instrument. One line would be to sum the difference scores for each subject and, therefore, develop a within person "D" which would then be used as a predictor variable for other important teacher behaviors. This D score might be related to in-class behavior using an interaction analysis adapted

for Value-Sharing categories (already in use), or a change in D score could be related to changes in approach toward different classes of pupils or pupil problems.

A second needed analysis is to understand better what accounted for the reduction in the difference scores reported. This could have occurred because of a shift in the endorsement for "ideal teacher" without any change in self report; or it could have resulted from an increase in "myself as teacher" scores with no change in "ideal teacher" reporting. Familiarity with the data suggests that the "ideal teacher" profile was reduced and less stereotyped for social desirability while the "myself as teacher" increased in the socially desirable direction (scores increased), but this is yet to be tested for stability by use of statistical methods.

Beyond the reanalysis of the present data available, there are a number of other areas which should be explored. The most obvious is to refine the instrument in use and include categories which stand a better chance of making important discriminations among the participants. Using additional target designations, such as, marijuana smokers, alcohol abusers, narcotic addicts, hyperactive child, etc., would extend the information about how this kind of training influences attitudes toward important target populations.

Finally, there is the evaluation of Value-Sharing itself other than the attitudinal ones investigated with the Semantic Differential form. What is taught in the courses? How do teachers use it in their classes? How many use it after the class is over? What is the impact on the students? I am pleased to be able to say that each question has either been investigated, is currently under investigation, or is imminently to be investigated. What

we have reported is just the beginning of systematic evaluation of this primary prevention technique.

TABLE 1

Factorial Design

Pretest		Posttest	
Real Teacher	Ideal Teacher	Real Teacher	Ideal Teacher
1 through 13	1 through 13	1 through 13	1 through 13

TABLE 2

Length of Course
Ideal - Real Scores
N = 103

Response	15 HOURS			45 HOURS		
	Pre	Post	Post-Pre	Pre	Post	Post-Pre
1	.76	.91	.15	.92	.54	-.38
2	1.26	1.13	-.13	1.60	.89	-.71
3	.97	1.02	.05	1.46	1.14	-.32
4	1.18	.80	-.38	1.15	.79	-.36
5	.31	.20	-.11	-.16	.20	.36
6	1.54	1.61	.07	1.60	1.24	-.36
7	.96	.57	-.39	.88	.49	-.39
8	1.00	1.05	.05	1.02	.51	-.51
9	1.48	1.09	-.39	1.37	.88	-.49
10	1.44	1.61	.17	1.47	1.19	-.28
11	.50	.35	-.15	.90	.58	-.32
12	.85	.61	-.24	1.10	.75	-.35
13	.17	.06	-.11	.24	.63	.39

REFERENCES

Bensley, M. L. (Ed). A Teacher's Guide to the Coronado Plan: Primary Level K-6. Coronado, California: Coronado Unified School District, 1971.

Carney, R. E. An Evaluation of the Effect of a Value-Oriented Drug Abuse Education Program Using the Risk Taking Attitude Questionnaire. Coronado, California: Coronado Unified School District, 1971.

DeLone, R. The Ups and Downs of Drug-Abuse Education, Saturday Review of Education, pp. 27-32, November 11, 1972.

Harmin, M., Kirschenbaum, H., and Simon, S. B. Clarifying Values through Subject Matter. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

Osgood, C.E., Suci,G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Raths, L.E., Harmin, M., and Simon, S.B. Values and Teaching. Columbus: Charles Merril Publishing Co., 1966.

Rogers, C. R. and Dymond, R. F. (Ed). Psychotherapy and Personality Change; Co-ordinated Studies in the Client Centered Approach. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rucker, W. R., Arnspiger, V. C., and Brodbeck, A. J. Human Values in Education. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1969.

Swisher, J., Crawford, J., Goldstein, R., Yura, M., Drug Education: Pushing or Preventing?, Peabody Journal of Education, 49: pp. 68-75, 1971.

Zazzaro, J., Drug Education: Is Ignorance Bliss?, Nation's Schools, 92(2): pp. 29-33, 1973.

Appendix

INFORMED CONSENT

One of the efforts at evaluating the impact of the training you are receiving will include the form which we would like you to fill out twice. Once at the beginning of the course, and once at the end. It is a simple form which we hope will measure some of the attitudes you hold about yourselves as teachers. The purpose is to see if we are at all effective in what we are trying to do. We are asking for some information to make our analysis more meaningful for us. Your specific responses will be coded and put on cards for analysis without any way of tracing it back to you. Furthermore, none of the results will be inspected until after the course is complete and grades assigned. If, however, you still don't feel comfortable filling out the forms, then don't simply hand it in blank, but we do hope that you will fill it out for our use. YOU ARE FREE TO WITHDRAW YOUR CONSENT AND TERMINATE YOUR PARTICIPATION AT ANY TIME.

To fill out the forms, simply place a mark in the middle of the spaces (_:X:_). The words describe dimensions along which you can think about certain roles of jobs you have. Put down your first impression, you don't have to think hard about an answer. If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your mark close to that word; if you feel that the concept is only slightly related to one end of the scale, place the mark closer to the middle.

IMPORTANT, on the first page which follows, write as a heading "MYSELF AS TEACHER". On the second page, write as a heading "AN IDEAL TEACHER". The task is to fill out the forms to describe yourself as a teacher and to describe what might be an ideal teacher.

To help us better understand what is happening with these results, would you give the following information: (Remember, after you fill these out and they are coded they will not be identifiable in the analysis.)

_____ MALE_____ FEMALE_____
NAME

DATE_____

NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING_____

GRADE LEVEL_____,_____,_____,_____

1. Active	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Passive
2. Good	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Bad
3. Relaxed	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Tense
4. Unpleasant	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Pleasant
5. Fast	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Slow
6. Dull	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Interesting
7. Flexible	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Rigid
8. Weak	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Strong
9. Effective	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Ineffective
10. Disorganized	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Organized
11. Fair	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Unfair
12. Unrewarding	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Rewarding
13. Controlled	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Independent

1. Active	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Passive
2. Good	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Bad
3. Relaxed	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Tense
4. Unpleasant	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Pleasant
5. Fast	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Slow
6. Dull	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Interesting
7. Flexible	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Rigid
8. Weak	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Strong
9. Effective	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Ineffective
10. Disorganized	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Organized
11. Fair	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Unfair
12. Unrewarding	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Rewarding
13. Controlled	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Independent